

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-15 and 17 are pending. The claims stand rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Davis (5633932) in view of Teitelbaum (5848231). The rejections are all based on the assertion that Teitelbaum teaches denying access to printer configuration controls unless a bio signature is entered that matches a bio signature associated with a print job. This assertion is not correct.

Each bio signature in Teitelbaum is associated with a particular computer system configuration. Teitelbaum, column 4 lines 9-16. System configuration includes "**available peripherals....**" Teitelbaum, column 4 line 13. Even if it is assumed for purposes of argument only that a bio signature is associated with a printer indirectly through its association with a system configuration that includes that printer as one of the available peripherals, the bio signature is still not associated with a print job. More importantly, Teitelbaum says nothing about the configuration of any of the "available peripherals." There is nothing in Teitelbaum that can reasonably be interpreted as teaching or even suggesting a bio signature is required to access the configuration controls of a printer.

The Examiner's statement that Teitelbaum teaches "that only a user with authorization is permitted access to configuration for a system of shared peripherals" (emphasis in original) is not relevant to the claimed subject matter. Claim 1 recites that *the printer* denies access to **configuration controls of the printer** unless a bio signature is entered that matches a bio signature associated with the print job. There is nothing in Teitelbaum that prevents anyone from walking up to any printer and accessing that printer's configuration controls. It might be that a particular user, one of the children for example, cannot send a print job from the host computer to a particular printer, but there is nothing in the use of a bio-signature in Teitelbaum's system configuration that prevents the child from walking up to the printer and accessing the printer's configuration controls.

The claims require a printer denying access to printer configuration controls unless a matching bio signature is entered. Teitelbaum by contrast configures the computer based on a bio signature. The combination of Davis and Teitelbaum does

not teach all claim limitations. The Examiner has, therefore, failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness and the rejections should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204